DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 882 PS 015 386

AUTHOR Young, Kathryn T.; Zigler, Edward
TITLE Infant and Toddler Day Care: Regulation and Policy Implications.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Certification; Child Caregivers; *Day Care Centers; Early Childhood Education; Educational Environment; Educational Quality; *Federal Legislation; Federal Regulation; *Infants; National Surveys; Personnel; Policy Formation; Program Evaluation; Psychological Needs; Quality Control; *State Legislation; State Standards; *Toddlers

ABSTRACT

This paper examines existing federal and state standards for the group care of infants and toddlers and offers suggestions for realistic and constructive child care policy for children and families in the 1980's. Particularly emphasized are the effects of day care environments on the psychological development of infants and toddlers and the differences between licensed and unlicensed child care facilities. Initially, a review of research which supports the necessity of day care standards is presented. Next, the current day care regulations at the federal and state levels are compared and data tabulated for individual state listings for staff and child ratio, group size, staff training, program content of child care centers, entry age, staff qualifications, and other factors). An analysis of existing regulations is provided which reveals deficiencies in the existing state day care regulations in mandating a safe and healthy day care environment for infants and toddlers. Finally, child care policy implications are discussed, including the need for enactment of Federal standards for day care, a national conference on day care, a government funded cost analysis of quality day care for the consumer, a national day care clearinghouse, the need for paid infant care leave, and parent education in selecting day care programs. (DST)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262882

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

INFANT AND TODDLER DAY CARE: REGULATION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Kathryn T. Young & Edward Zigler

Yale University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathryn T. Young

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Kathryn T. Young is a predoctoral Bush Fellow. Edward Zigler is Sterling Professor of Psychology.

PS 015386

Abstract

Recent research indicates there are identifiable and important characteristics of the day care environment that influence its quality and ultimately the psychological development of infants and toddlers. An analysis of existing licensing requirements indicates there is great variation among the states in standards for infant and toddler day care. These variations translate into a wide range of questionable experiences for these very young children.

Infant and Toddler Day Care:

Regulation and Policy Implications

Due to the increasing number of mothers who by choice or necessity work out of the home, there have been dramatic changes in the way many of the nation's children are being raised. In 1982 the Census Bureau reported that 41% of women with children under one year of age, and 38% of women with children under three were employed outside the home. Just a year later the Bureau of Labor (1983) reported comparable statistics of 45% and 44% respectively. While after school care (or noncare) has long been a common practice, these figures indicate that today much younger children are routinely placed in day care. Perhaps this explains why day care for infants and toddlers is currently the fastest growing type of out-of-home care.[18]

The environments in which children of working mothers are being cared for include both licensed facilities (day care centers, family day care homes, and group day care homes) and unlicensed family and group homes. It would not be surprising if the unlicensed facilities far outnumber those which are licensed. Undoubtedly the most common day care arrangement is for a relative or friend to babysit while the parents work, because such settings are usually closer to home and less costly than more formal types of care.

This rapid shift in childrearing environments for very young children raises many important questions. The most crucial concerns the effects of day care environments on the psychological development of infants and toddlers. Although this area of research is expanding rapidly, the topic is simply too new for any final conclusions to be drawn. This however does not mean that we

can do nothing but stand around and wait for the answers. For better or worse, day care exists for literally millions of young children. In this paper we examine existing federal and state standards for the group care of infants and toddlers. This analysis will hopefully suggest realistic and constructive child care policy for children and families in the 1980's.

Research Informing Day Care Standards

The effects of day care on children's development have been the focus of research and lively debate for 15 years. This literature (reviewed by Gamble & Zigler[17]) is beyond the scope of this paper. Here we will examine those studies which show why and sometimes which day care standards are necessary.

One of the first studies to describe the character of group day care facilities in America was Windows on Day Care.[21] The picture the investigators painted was fairly grim. Only 10 percent of 431 day care centers were described as providing "superior" care. Half of the centers were "fair or custodial in nature providing no educational services beyond the meeting of physical needs" (p.5). A shocking 11% were rated as poor, with vivid descriptions of "double-decker cardboad cribs in a room with open gas heaters" and "babies in a dark room strapped into an infant seat inside a crib and crying" (p.64). Although the methods of evaluation were subjective and very global, the study alerted social scientists and policymakers to the need for more rigorous assessment of day care environments.

Clearly, being tied in a crib all day is not in the child's best interest. But exactly what is in the child's best interest? This question might seem

unanswerable, since theorists cannot agree on what parents themselves do to optimize their children's development, and on what practices are best suited to different children. Nonetheless, research suggests some tentative but reasonable ideas.

Beginning with the children themselves, a number of studies and reviews have failed to identify negative consequences of early entry into day care.[6,9,10,19,25,27,30] Clarke-Stewart[10] not only found no risk, but even suggested that day care children are more mature intellectually and socially than home-reared children when they begin school.

In another frequently noted study, Kagan and his colleagues[19] offered similar positive findings that infants who entered day care as early as 3 1/2 months were no different in measures of attachment, cognition, and social play than infants reared at home. Despite their conclusion that a young child's social, emotional, and cognitive development can proceed normally in a day care facility, these investigators recommended that infants not begin group day care before 3 months of age, and that one caregiver be responsible for no more than three infants. Rutter[30] also stressed the importance of an adult not caring for more than three infants. Many of the studies failing to find any negative consequences of early group day care appear to be open to two major criticisms. First, the centers investigated in most of these studies were university based and thus not representative of those typically available to most parents. Second, the longitudinal aspects of the studies were not of a long enough duration to support any final conclusions.

Other workers have noted the potentially damaging effects on the psychological development of children as a result of early group day care.[2,7,16,17,34] This concern stems in part from findings that in the early months of life an interactive phenomenon is developing between mother and infant which requires close proximity and considerable time together.[8,31] This work demonstrates that the mother and the infant are repeatedly learning how to respond to the rhythmic changes in the other, a process characterized by reciprocal influence. These early interactions not only reflect depth of attachment but also provide opportunities for the infant to learn about the environment and how to function within it.

Several investigators have expressed concern about the effects of early group care on attachment behavior (see Gamble & Zigler).[17] For example Farber and Egeland[13] followed a low income population who used community based day care. Infants who had begun day care before their first birthday had an increased likelihood of exhibiting anxious-avoidant attachments toward their mothers. At 24 months these same infants displayed less enthusiasm and were less compliant in problem-solving tasks than those children who had begun day care at a later age. These findings have been replicated by other investigators.[5] It should be emphasized that these studies involved poor quality community day care and unstable child care arrangements with frequent changes in caregiving.

In terms of eventual consequences, these types of anxious attachment relationships have been found to predict problems in adjusting to peers during the preschool years.[3,4,22] Gamble and Zigler[17] suggested that such problems

may be more evident in males, who appear to be more sensitive to variations in caregiving environments than females. These reviewers also concluded that early group care may be particularly detrimental to the development of young children who reside in families who are already experiencing stress.

However these conflicting findings on the effects of early group care are reconciled, workers appear to agree that poor quality care in general and unstable caregivers in particular can be detrimental to infant development. Belsky[5] analyzed how the findings concerning quality of day care are consistent with those on family influences in child development. The same qualities of parental care which promote healthy psychological development in infancy and toddlerhood are also necessary for caregivers in day care settings. That is, caregivers need to be involved and sensitive to the child's developmental needs, to be able to control behavior without being restrictive, and to facilitate linguistic communication.

This brings us to the issue of caregivers and the qualities they must possess to be suitable parental substitutes. Like day care settings, caregivers can be licensed or unlicensed, good or bad. The National Day Care Study (NDCS), systematically investigated the effects that variations in day care staff (e.g., staff:child ratio, group size, staff qualifications) had on the development of young children.[29] They reported that for infants and toddlers, "high staff:child ratios (fewer children per caregiver) as well as small group size were associated with less overt distress and apathy on the part of the children, less exposure to potential physical harm, and less management activities on the part of caregivers" (p.82).[28] The NDCS also

indicated that for staff, specialized training in areas such as child development, day care, or early childhood education, rather than general level of formal education, was a more significant variable in promoting a high degree of social interaction with the children. Caregivers' training also positively influenced gains on the children's scores on standardized tests.[28] A further study of family day care environments supported the NDCS findings that both group size and caregiver training influence the quality of a child's experience and subsequent development.[15]

Current Day Care Regulations

Federal Level

The federal government has vascillated since 1968 in their involvement with day care regulations.[11,23] During this period experts who represent the best wisdom in the field have proposed, revised, and reproposed federal regulations for day care. Because of the cost implications,[28] the regulations suggested have not been optimal but rather minimal standards for day care - - a standard below which the child's development could be impaired. To date the federal role is still unclear, and the 1980 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) have been withdrawn. In spite of this, the withdrawn FIDCR have repeatedly served as a guideline for minimum standards when day care quality is being discussed. Therefore, in this paper the 1980 FIDCR will serve as a basis of comparison in examining the existing state regulations for day care centers, family day care homes, and group day care homes.

The FIDCR proposed guidelines in several areas for each type of setting separately. The staff:child ratio for day care centers is 1:3 for infants (birth to 24 months) and 1:4 for toddlers (24-36 months). The ratio for family day care is 1:5, provided that no more than two of these children are under two years of age. In a day care home in which all children are under two years of age, the staff:child ratio is 1:3. The ratio is 1:6 only if all children are are over two years of age. The proposed group size for all types of day care is six for infants and 12 for toddlers. The FIDCR also recommends that state agencies establish and implement specialized training programs in child care so that caregivers are knowledgegable in child care in order to be employed in a day care facility. In terms of program of care for the children, there is a general proposal for developmentally apppropriate activities which promote social, intellectual, emotional, and physical development.

State Level

Information for the analysis of the current state regulations was obtained from the Comparative Licensing Study, Profiles of State Day Care Licensing Requirements for Day Care Centers, Family Day Care Homes and Group Day Care Homes.[1] This five-volume work is a secondary source; it does not print each state's complete regulations as written, but rather has reorganized the information so that the format is the same for each state. For this paper regulations for

each of the 50 states were examined in regard to staff:child ratio, group size, staff training in child development, specific program objectives for infants and toddlers, entry age for infants, and staff qualifications. The distinction between the three types of day care, center, family and group, generally has been based on two factors: number of children enrolled and location of the facility. Day care centers which provide care for no fewer than 12 children are located in nonresidential buildings. Both family and group day care operate in private homes, where the caregiver may be related or unrelated to the children. The number of children served ranges from more than one to 12.

All 50 states have regulations to guide the operation and licensing of day care centers (see Table 1). Forty-four states regulate family day care homes (Table 2) but only 14 states have specific regulations for group day care homes. However, based on the number of children served, in all but 6 states group day care licensing is covered by either day care center or family day care home regulations. A summary of the state regulations for day care centers and family day care homes is presented in Table 3.

Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3 about here

Staff:Child Ratio. State ratio regulations for infants in day care centers range from 1:3 to 1:8. Sixteen percent of the states have no ratio requirements for children under two. Only three states meet the 1980 FIDCR, while many (18) allow a 1:4 ratio for infant care. The regulations for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

staff:child ratio for toddler care range from 1:4 to 1:15, with only four states complying with the withdrawn FIDCR. Forty percent of the states allow 8 or 10 toddlers to be cared for by a single adult. Only one state, Massachusetts, meets the 1980 FIDCR staff:child ratio for both infants and toddlers.

Although many states do not have specific regulations for staff:child ratios in family day care homes, the regulations for maximum number of children allowed serves as a comparable measure. Only eleven states comply with the model FIDCR for group composition. Twenty-two states allow one adult to care for six children without any limitation on the number of infants or toddlers allowed. The staff:child ratio for group day care homes ranges from 1:3 to 1:12, with eight out of the 14 states that have regulations allowing a 1:6 ratio. None of these states comply with the 1980 FIDCR in specifying a maximum number of infants or toddlers within an established child care ratio.

Group Size. The NDCS has indicated group size is an important characteristic in the quality of day care environments. However, by statute or regulation, 62 percent of the states find it quite acceptable not to have group size regulations for day care centers. For the states which do, the range is from 6 to 20 for infants with 8 being the most commonly cited number. Only three states comply with the withdrawn FIDCR of six for infant group size. The range for group size for toddlers is from 6 to 35. Eleven states comply with the FIDCR of 12. Only one state, Alabama, meets the FIDCR for group size for both infants and toddlers.

Group size is not specified in any of the state regulations for family and group homes. Rather, the concept of maximum number of children allowed is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

specified and will be used here in place of group size. In family day care home regulations, the maximum number of children includes the day care providers children who are under school age. The range is from 4 to 16 with half of the states allowing a maximum of six children. Seventy four percent of the states do not limit the number of infants or toddlers allowed in a family day care home. For group day care homes, the maximum number of children allowed ranges from 6 to 13 but the states vary as to whether day care provider's children are included in this number.

Staff Training. In view of the NCDS findings and FIDCR, it is disappointing that 52 percent of the states allow a person with no previous training in child care or development to be the director of a day care center. For family and group day care homes only a minimal number of states (6 and 5 respectively) require the operators of homes to have had a course in child development or child care. The picture is even more bleak in regard to training for caregivers. Only eight states require caregivers in day care centers and group day care homes to have had training in child care. Five states require caregivers in family day care homes to have had specific training. Although many states recommended the Child Development Associate (CDA) credential as one option for training in child development, only one state specified it as a minimum requirement to work in a group day care facility. A majority of states, however, do make some attempt to recommend training in child care as part of an inservice or post employment program

Program of Care. The withdrawn FIDCR specify that the program of care for children in all types of day care facilities should include developmentally

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

appropriate activities which promote social, intellectual, emotional, and physical development. In our analysis, each state's regulations were rated on a scale of 1 to 3, reflecting the degree to which they met the withdrawn 1980 FIDCR. The criteria for each category were as follows: (See footnote 1)

1 = No program regulations for infant and toddler care.

2 = Regulations exist pertaining to factors such as nutrition, health, and safety, but they do not specify a developmentally oriented program of care.

3 = Regulations meet the FIDCR.

For day care centers 58 percent of the states did not mandate developmental programs of care for infants and toddlers. The regulations were so minimal in some states that items such as toilet training or formula refrigeration were all that were included. In one state the "regulations" specified only that "infants and toddlers should be offered water at intervals. Infants shall not remain in cribs, baby beds or playpens all day" (vol. 2, p. 25). It must be noted that the 1980 FIDCR for program of activities are so ambiguous that compliance is simply the matter of the right rhetoric. Many of the 21 states which did comply showed no way to operationalize the developmental program they mandated. However, five states had regulations which far exceeded the proposed FIDCR and included the concepts of individualized care, continuity, rest, stimulation, parent paricipation, and readiness.

For family day care homes, 20 states do not specify any program of care for infants or toddlers. Fourteen states do have minimal standards which fail to meet the FIDCR. Ten states, however, specify developmentally oriented

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

programs of activities which meet the FIDCR. In relation to the 14 states which have group day care regulations, two states have no program regulations, five have regulations which do not meet the FIDCR, and seven meet the FIDCR.

Day Care Components not Addressed by FIDCR. The FIDCR omit several areas particularly relevant to the care of very young children. First, there is no recommendation for the minimum age an infant can enter group day care. With this increased demand for day care for infants and toddlers and the disagreement among experts about its effects, prudence dictates that some guidelines be considered. Second, the withdrawn FIDCR have very general recommendations for staff qualifications. Not only are there no age, education, or experience requirements, but there is no differentation according to position (aide, caregiver, director). Although training in child care is specified, there is no mention of specialized training in the care of very young children. The developmental tasks of infancy and toddlerhood are unique and we believe that caregivers for this age range need to be knowledgable in order to provide appropriate care. In spite of this lack of federal attention, individual states have taken varying degrees of responsibility in establishing licensing requirements for minimum entry age for infants and more specific staff qualifications.

Entry Age. The majority of states (32) do not specify a minimum entry age or allow infants to be cared for anytime after birth in day care centers. Only one state, Virginia, requires that an infant be 3 months old before entering a day care center. For family day care, a vast majority of states (41) do not specify a minimum age. Two states, Alaska and Tennessee, do require an infant

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to be 6 weeks old, and New York requires that the infant be 8 week old. Almost all of the 14 states which regulate group day care homes do not limit the minimum entry age. Connecticut requires the infant to be 4 weeks old and Tennessee specifies 6 weeks for group home care.

Staff Qualifications. Many states had a range for age, education, and experience qualifications for directors and caregivers, so the minimum requirement was used in our analysis. In 13 states day care center directors did not have to be a certain age. The majority of states required the director to be at least 18 or 21 years old. The minimum educational level varied from 12 states with no specifications to one state requiring a B.A. with courses in child development. The most common requirement is a high school diploma. A majority (31) of states require the director to have at least one year's previous experience in a day care facility.

For the director or operator of a family day care home, 11 states had no minimum age requirement, and 27 states required the operator to be at least 18 years old. A minimum educational level was not specified in a majority (28) of the states. Only two states demanded a high school diploma, and 41 states allowed a person to be the director of a family day care home without any previous day care experience. Most of the 14 states with regulations for group day care homes required the director to be at least 18 years old. The educational requirements ranged from 6 states with no requirement to 5 with a high school diploma. Five states did require the director of a group day care home to have at least one year's experience in a day care facility.

Qualifications for employment as a child caregiver were even less rigorous.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In day care centers, 50 percent of the states required caregivers to be at least 18 years of age. However, 11 states had no age requirement, and nine states allowed individuals as young as 16 to be primary caregivers, not aides who work under supervision. The educational levels for child caregivers was minimal with 31 states not even requiring a high school diploma. Only 14 states required previous experience in a child care facility. The qualifications for child caregivers in family day care were similar to those of director or operator. The minimum age ranged from 14 to 21 years old, but 13 states had no age requirement. Thirty-one states had no minimum educational requirement; 13 states did demand some education but none of these exceeded a high school diploma. Virtually all of the states (43) had no previous experience requirement. The qualifications for child caregivers in group day care homes were similar to those for family day care. However, five of the 14 states which have regulations required some sort of previous training or experience with children in order to work in a group day care home.

To date, 80 percent of the states allow infants and toddlers to be cared for by persons who have not had any specific training or course work with children under three years of age. The situation for family and group day care homes is even worse. Colorado (family day care) and Delaware (group day care) are the only states which stipulate that at least one caregiver have training or experience with children under 2 years of age.

Interpretation

This analysis of existing regulations presents a very bleak picture with great variation among the states in standards for infant and toddler day care.

Only one state meets the 1980 FIDCR for staff:child ratio for both infants and toddlers in day care centers. Further, a large majority of states do not even address the issue of group size for any type of day care facility. As mentioned earlier, the National Day Care Study emphasized the importance of small group size for the healthy development of young children. Without group size specificiations, day care facilities could easily comply with regulations for staff:child ratio while having warehouse operations in which large numbers of infants and toddlers are cared for in one space where noise, chaos, and assembly line care prevail.

The overall regulations for staff qualifications for all three types of day care are so minimal that the possibility of having a "qualified" staff is virtually non-existent. In 80 percent of the states, directors and caregivers are allowed to take care of infants and toddlers without any specific course work or training specific to children under three years of age. In a majority of states, the existing regulations allow these very young children to be cared for by a staff which would have a mean age of 18; has not graduated from high school, and has had no previous group day care experience. This occurs despite the fact that 21 states specify a regulation for some type of developmentally appropriate program of care for infants and toddlers in day care centers. How these programs are to be carried out by untrained personnel is puzzling and unrealistic. Further, the majority of states allow infants to enter group day care anytime after birth. The thought of placing a newborn infant in the care of a novice is shocking. (Even new mothers receive some guidance during their hospital stay.) Perhaps the implicit assumption is that little knowledge or experience is necessary in order to care for them.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Although an informal network of learning about child care has worked well within the family structure, the personal relationships and provision of care are different when caring for others' children in a group setting.[24]

We must mention briefly the issue of enforcement of day care regulations. We noted earlier that perhaps the majority of day care facilities (most likely family day care) are unlicensed. These operate outside of regulation but it seems reasonable to expect the standards of care to range from horrendous to superior. Licensed facilities must comply with state regulations in order to open their doors, but whether the standards are maintained is an open question. States vary in their policies of periodic inspections, unannounced visits, and procedures for license renewal. Some states require inspections only once every three years which translates into no actual monitoring of quality in day care facilities. In addition, one would not predict 100% compliance with state regulations in any case and where these are weak to begin with and not enforced in the end, this virtually guarantees the certainty of the legal licensing of facilities where children are subjected to custodial care or neglect.

Child Care Policy Implications

The existing state day care regulations clearly are deficient in mandating a safe and healthy day care environment for infants and toddlers. The response to this day care dilemma by those concerned with the well-being of children and families has been to continue to push for enactment of Federal Standards for day care. Given the present political and social climate in America, the orientation has been away from Federal regulation towards one of

state and personal responsiblity.[23, 28, 33] The withdrawal of Federal leadership since 1980 has been tragic. However, the lowering of state standards, reductions in funding, and the incidents of child abuse have been evidence to many that Federal guidance in day care is still needed. In addition to the 1984 Department of Health and Human Services recommendations for model day care, Congress has recently proposed several initiatives in the area of child care.[32] Congress has proposed improvements in staff:child ratio, staff training, licensing and monitoring, health and safety, and parent involvement.

The current Zeitgeist generates three policy initiatives. First, steps need to be taken to allow states to benefit from research findings on day care. There is an abundance of information on day care that needs to be available to providers and consumers. A national conference on day care would provide the forum for state policymakers, care providers, and parents to become more knowledgeable about the characteristics of day care particularly important to infant and toddler development.

In preparation for such a conference, the Federal government should fund a cost analysis of quality day care for the consumer.[29] Gamble & Zigler[17] indicate that infant and toddler day care is very expensive. Specifically, they estimate care which includes high staff:child ratio, small group size, stability among caregivers, and trained personnel would cost at least $150.00 per week. If states are to insist on these standards which insure safety and quality, then mechanisms need to be established so that care is not limited to the small number of families which can afford it. There is little value in establishing standards which make day care too costly for the majority of

parents. In addition, quality child care can only occur in an environment that has trained caregivers. Therefore, resources necessary for staff training programs need to be part of the overall cost analysis.

A natural outgrowth of such conference would be the establishment of a national day care clearinghouse.[28] Although there are many local efforts to provide information about day care, at times there is the feeling of reinventing the wheel. A national clearinghouse would serve the function of gathering, evaluating, and providing the most current information to legislators, providers, parents, and policymakers at all levels.

The second policy initiative relates directly to the value our society places on the care of infants and toddlers. When a family chooses day care, they are not buying a service that permits both parents to work but rather are purchasing an environment which influences the development of their child. As consumers of day care parents have the potential for being a powerful force in influencing aspects of their infants' and toddlers' day care experiences. In the tradition of Head Start, model day care programs which have a formal parent-provider partnership need to be established in order to educate both parents and providers. Necessary components of these model programs would include the parents' right to unlimited access to their child's program, and the provider's responsibility in providing parents with periodic progress reports. In the long term, this type of parent-provider partnership may be more effective than the perfunctory yearly state licensing visits. Yet, up to the present parental involvement in their child's day care appears to have been minimal.[35]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As a third policy initiative our nation should examine the possibility of paid infant care leaves. Given the concern about early entry into group day care settings, many workers have recommended that infants remain in the care of the parents for the first 3 to 6 months of life.[7,19,34] For health reasons alone, an argument could be made for keeping very young children out of group settings. A recent study found that for infants under 1 year old, the chance of getting a bacterial disease that is the leading cause of meningitis and epiglottitis in a child is 12.3 times greater if they are in day care rather than cared for at home.[26] Furthermore, a longer period at home also allows the continuation of breast-feeding which strengthens the infant's defenses against disease.

In addition to physical health considerations, we must recognize that parents do not become skillful in parenting overnight. It takes time and effort on the part of parents and the infant to devleop a satisfying relationship. A 3- to 6-month period at home allows them time to get to know each other and to form a solid attachment. Once this relationship has been established parents are better able to make child care choices appropriate for their infant and themselves.[12] It should be noted that the United States is the only Western nation which does not have some form of uniform paid infant care leave available to all new parents. Given the high cost of quality infant day care, more information is needed to determine if paid infant care leaves would be more cost effective in the long run. Currently the Yale Bush Center for Child Developmental and Social Policy has organized an Infant Care Leave Advisory Committee to study the feasibility of such a leave.

Although government licensing and monitoring alone cannot guarantee the safety and security of these very young children, they can contribute significantly to ensuring that these goals are met. As a society we are at a crossroads where we can continue to treat children and families as we have since World War II, or we can take account of the changing demographic trends. It is clear that the growing number of infants and toddlers in group day care environments necessitates constructive thought and action in order to insure the healthy development of the next generation.

References

1. Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Office of Human Development Services. 1982. Comparative Licensing Study, Profiles of State Day Care Licensing Requirements for Day Care Centers. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C.

2. AINSWORTH, M. 1973. The development of infant-mother attachment. In Review of Child Development Research, B. Caldwell and N. Ricciuti, eds. Vol. 3, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

3. AREND, R., GOVE, F., & SROUFE, L.A. 1979. Continuity of individual adaptation from infancy to kindergarten: a predictive study of ego-resiliency and curiosity in preschoolers. Child Development, 50, 950-959.

4. BARON, M. & SCHWARTZ, C. 1981. Day care in the middle class: effects in elementary school. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Los Angeles, CA.

5. BELSKY, J. 1984. Two waves of day care research: developmental effects and conditions of quality. In The Child and the Day Care Setting, R. Ainslie, ed. Praeger Publishers, New York.

6. BELSKY, J. AND STEINBERG, L.D. 1978. The effects of day care: a critical review. Child Development 49:929-949.

7. BRAZELTON, T.B. 1984. Stress and Supports for Families in the 1980's. Presentation at a conference at Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA.

8. BRAZELTON, T.B., KOSLOWSKI, B. AND MAIN, M. 1974. The orgins of reciprocity: the early mother-infant interaction. In the Effect of the Infant on Its Caregiver, M. Lewis and L. Rosenblum, ed. John Wiley, New York.

9. CALDWELL, B., WRIGHT, C., HONIG, A. AND TANNEBAUM, J. 1970. Infant care and attachment. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 40:397-412.

10. CLARKE-STEWART, A. 1982. Daycare. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

11. COHEN, D. AND ZIGLER, E. 1977. Federal day care standards: rationale and recommendations. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 47:456-465.

12. Committee on Public Policy and Public Education. 1984. Who Will Mind the Babies? National Center for Clinical Infant Programs, Washington, D.C.

13. FARBER, E. AND EGELAND, B. 1982. Developmental consequences of out-of -home care for infants in a low income population. In Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issue, E. Zigler, and E. Gordon, eds. Auburn House Publishing Co., Boston, MA.

14. Federal Register, 1980. Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

15. FOSBURG, S. AND HAWKINS, P. 1981. Final Report of the National Day Care Home Study, Vol. 1. Abt Books, Cambridge, MA.

16. FRAIBERG, S. 1977. Every Child's Birthright: In Defense of Mothering. Basic Books, New York.

17. GAMBLE, T. AND ZIGLER, E. 1985. Effects of infant day care: another look at the evidence, unpublished manuscript.

18. JONES E, AND PRESCOTT E. 1982. Day care: short and long term solution? In the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 461:91-101.

19. KAGAN, J., KEARSLEY, R. & ZELAZO, P. 1978. The effects of infant day care on psychological development. In The Growth of The Child, J. Kagan,

ed. W.N. Norton, New York.

20. KAMERMAN, S.B. AND KAMM, A.J. 1981. Child Care, Family Benefits and Working Parents: A Study in Comparative Policy. Columbia University Press, New York.

21. KEYSERLING, M. 1972. Windows on Day Care. National Council of Jewish Women, New York.

22. MCCARTHEY, K., SCARR, S., PHILLIPS, D., GRAJEK, S. AND SCHWARTZ, J.C. 1982. Environmental differences among day care centers and their effcts on children's development. In Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues, E. Zigler and E. Gordon, eds. Auburn House Publishing Co., Boston, MA.

23. NELSON, J. 1982. The politics of federal day care regulation. In Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues, E. Zigler and E. Gordon, eds. Auburn House Publishing Co., Boston, MA.

24. PROVENCE, S. 1982. Infant day care: Relationships between theory and practice. In Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues, E. Zigler and E. GORDON, eds. Auburn House Publishing Co., Boston, MA.

25. RAMEY, C., DORVAL, B., AND BAKER-WARD, L. 1981. Group day care and socially disadvantaged families: effects on the child and family. In Advances in Early Education and Day Care. S. Kilmer, ed. jai Press, Greenwich, CT.

26. REDMOND, S. AND PICHICHERO, M. 1985. Hemophilus influences type B disease: an epidemiologic study with special references to day care centers. Journal of the American Medical Association, 252:2581-2584.

27. RICCIUTI, H. 1974. Fear and development of social attachments in the

first years of life. In The Origins of Human Behavior: Fear, M. Lewis and L.A. Rosenblum, eds. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

28. RUOPP, R., AND TRAVERS, J. 1982. Janus faces day care: perspectives on quality and cost. In Day care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues, E. Zigler and E. Gordon, eds. Auburn House Publishing Co., Boston, MA.

29. RUOPP, R., Travers, J., Glantz, F. and Coelen, C. 1974. Children at the Center. Abt Associates, Inc., Cambridge, MA.

30. RUTTER, M. 1982. Social-emotional consequences of day care for preschool children. In Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues, E. Zigler and E. Gordon, eds. Auburn House Publishing Co., Boston, MA.

31. STERN, D. 1974. Mother and infant at play: the dyadic interaction involving facial, vocal and gaze behaviors. In The Effect of the Infant on Its Caregiver, M. Lewis and L. Rosenblum, eds. John Wiley, New York.

32. United States Senate. March 28, 1985. Congressional Record, Washington, D.C.

33. ZIGLER, E. 1984. Child care: beginnning a national initiative. Testimony, House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. Washington, D.C.

34. ZIGLER, E. AND MUENCHOW, S. 1983. Infant day care and infant-care leaves. American Psychologist, 38, 91-94.

35. ZIGLER, E. AND TURNER, P. 1982. Parents and day care mothers: a failed partnership? In Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues, E. Zigler and E. Gordon, eds. Auburn House Publishing Co., Boston, MA.

Footnote

1. Interrater reliability was 95 percent for 10 randomly selected states program of care regulations for both day care centers and family day care homes.

Author Notes

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Robert Hodapp for comments on an earlier draft of this article, Sally Styfco for editorial assistance, and Sandra Masterson for preparation of the manuscript.

TABLE 1

DAY CARE CENTER CHARACTERISTICS[1]

	Staff:Child Ratio		Group Size		Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care for Infants/Toddlers
	Infant	Toddler	Infant	Toddler	Director	Caregiver	
FIDCR	1:3	1:4	6	12	specialized training in child care		Developmentally appropriate activities which promote social, emotional, intellectual, physical development
STATES							
Alabama	1:6	1:6	6	6	No	No	meets FIDCR
Alaska	1:5	1:10	*	*	No	No	meets FIDCR
Arizona	1:8	1:10	*	*	No	No	meets FIDCR
Arkansas	1:6	1:9	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
California	1:4	1:12	*	*	Yes	No	does not meet FIDCR
Colorado	1:5	1:5	*	*	Yes	Yes	meets FIDCR
Connecticut	1:4	1:4	8	8	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Delaware	1:5	1:8	8	8	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Florida	1:6	1:8-12	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDR
Georgia	1:7	1:10	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Hawaii	*	1:10	*	*	Yes	No	*
Idaho	1:6	1:8	*	*	No	No	meets FIDCR
Illinois	1:4	1:5	12	15	Yes	No	meets FIDCR
Indiana	1:4	1:5	8	10	Yes	No	meets FIDCR

1 information from Comparative Licensing Study, 1982
* not specified

TABLE 1 (CONT.)

DAY CARE CENTER CHARACTERISTICS [1]

	Staff:Child Ratio		Group Size		Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care for Infants/Toddlers
	Infant	Toddler	Infant	Toddler	Director	Caregiver	
FIDCR	1:3	1:4	6	12	Specialized training in child care		Developmentally appropriate activities which promote social, emotional, intellectual, physical development
STATES							
Iowa	1:4	1:6	*	*	No	No	meets FIDCR
Kansas	1:3	1:5	9	12	Yes	No	meets FIDCR
Kentucky	1:6	1:8	*	*	No	No	meets FIDCR
Louisiana	1:6	1:12	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Maine	*	1:8	*	*	Yes	No	*
Maryland	*	1:6	12	20	Yes	Yes	*
Massachusetts	1:3	1:4	7	9	Yes	Yes	meets FIDCR
Michigan	1:4	1:10	*	*	Yes	No	does not meet FIDCR
Minnesota	1:4	1:7	*	*	Yes	Yes	meets FIDCR
Mississippi	*	*	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Missouri	1:4	1:8	8	8	Yes	No	meets FIDCR
Montana	*	1:10	*	15	No	No	*
Nebraska	1:4	1:5	*	*	Yes	No	does not meet FIDCR
Nevada	1:4	1:8	*	*	Yes	Yes	meets FIDCR

1 information from Comparative Licensing Study, 1982

* not specified

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1 (CONT.)

DAY CARE CENTER CHARACTERISTICS[1]

	Staff:Child Ratio		Group Size		Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care for Infants/Toddlers
	Infant	Toddler	Infant	Toddler	Director	Caregiver	
FIDCR	1:3	1:4	6	12	specialized training in child care		Developmentally appropriate activities which promote social, emotional, intellectual, physical development
STATES							
New Hampshire	*	*	*	*	No	No	*
New Jersey	*	1:10	*	*	Yes	Yes	does not meet FIDCR
New Mexico	1:7	1:15	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
New York	1:4	1:5	8	10	Yes	No	does not meet FIDCR
N. Carolina	1:8	1:12	7	9	No	No	meets FIDCR
N. Dakota	1:4	1:4	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Ohio	1:8	1:10	16	*	Yes	No	does not meet FIDCR
Oklahoma	1:4-1:6	1:8	*	*	No	No	meets FIDCR
Oregon	1:4	1:4	8	8	Yes	No	meets FIDCR
Pennsylvania	1:4	1:5	*	*	Yes	No	does not meet FIDCR
Rhode Island	*	*	*	*	Yes	Yes	*
S. Carolina	1:8	1:12	*	*	Yes	No	meets FIDCR
S. Dakota	1:5	1:5	20	20	No	No	*
Tennessee	1:5	1:8	16	16	No	No	*

1 information from Comparative Licensing Study, 1982
* not specified

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1 (CONT.)

DAY CARE CENTER CHARACTERISTICS[1]

	Staff:Child Ratio		Group Size		Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care for Infants/Toddlers
	Infants	Toddlers	Infants	Toddlers	Director	Caregiver	
FIDCR	1:3	1:4	6	12	specialized training in child care		Developmentally appropriate activities which promote social. emotional, intellectual, physical development
STATES							
Texas	1:5-7	1:9-13	*	35	No	No	meets FIDCR
Utah	1:4	1:7	8	25	No	No	*
Vermont	1:5	1:5	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Virginia	1:4	1:10	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Washington	1:5	1:7	10	14	Yes	No	*
W. Virginia	1:4	1:8	*	*	Yes	No	meets FIDCR
Wisconsin	1:3	1:6	8	16	Yes	Yes	meets FIDCR
Wyoming	1:5	1:8	*	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR

1 information from Comparative Licensing Study, 1982
* not specified

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2

FAMILY DAY CARE CHARACTERISTICS[1]

	Group Composition	Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care for Infants/Toddlers
FIDCR	1:5 staff child ratio with no more than 2 children under 2 yrs. old 1:3 if all children under 2 yrs. old 1:6 if all children 2-3 yrs. old	Specialized Training in Child Care Director	Caregiver	Developmentally appropriate activities which promote social, emotional, intellectual, physical development
STATES				
Alabama	1:6	Yes	No	*
Alaska	1:8; 2 under 2yrs. old	No	No	meets FIDCR
Arizona	No Regulations			
Arkansas	1:6; 3 under 2½ yrs. old	No	No	meets FIDCR
California	1:6; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	*
Colorado	1:4 for 0-2½ yrs. old 1:3 if under 1 yr. old	Yes	Yes	does not meet FIDCR
Connecticut	1:5; 1 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Delaware	1:3 infants	No	No	*
Florida	1:5 pre-schoolers	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Georgia	1:3; 3 or more under 2½ yrs. old	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Hawaii	1:5; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	*
Idaho	1:6	No	No	does not meet FIDCR

1 information from Comparative Licensing Study, 1982
* not specified

TABLE 2 (CONT.)

FAMILY DAY CARE CHARACTERISTICS[1]

STATES	Group Composition	Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care for Infants/Toddlers
		Director	Caregiver	
Illinois	1:8; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	meets FIDCR
Indiana	1:6	No	No	*
Iowa	1:6; 4 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	*
Kansas	1:6 with 1 infant 1:5 with 2 infants	No	No	*
Kentucky	1:6	No	No	meets FIDCR
Louisiana	No Regulations			
Maine	No Regulations			
Maryland	1:4	No	No	*
Massachusetts	1:3 with 3 or more under 2 yrs. old	Yes	Yes	*
Michigan	1:6; 2 under 1 yr.	No	No	*
Minnesota	1:5 1:4 infants	No	No	meets FIDCR
Mississippi	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Missouri	1:6	No	No	*
Montana	1:6; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	*
Nebraska	1:8; 2 under 18 mos. 1:4 infants	No	No	does not meet FIDCR

TABLE 2 (CONT.)

FAMILY DAY CARE CHARACTERISTICS[1]

	Group Composition	Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care Infants/Toddlers
		Director	Caregiver	
STATES				
Nevada	1:6	No	Yes	meets FIDCR
New Hampshire	1:6; 2 under 2½ yrs. old 1:4 infants	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
New Jersey	No Regulations			
New Mexico	No Regulations			
New York	1:6; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	*
N. Carolina	1:6	No	No	*
N. Dakota	1:6; 3 under 2 yrs. old 1:4 infants	No	No	*
Ohio	No Regulations			
Oklahoma	1:5	No	No	meets FIDCR
Oregon	1:5; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	*
Pennsylvania	1:6; 4 under 3 yrs. old	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Rhode Island	*	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
S. Carolina	1:3	No	No	meets FIDCR
S. Dakota	1:4; 0-3 yrs. old	No	No	*
Tennessee	1:7 1:4; 0-2 yrs. old	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Texas	1:4 infants 1:6 2 infants	No	No	*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2 (CONT.)

FAMILY DAY CARE CHARACTERISTICS[1]

STATES	Group Composition	Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care for Infants/Toddlers
		Director	Caregiver	
Utah	1:6; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Vermont	1:2 infants 1:6; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	meets FIDCR
Virginia	1:4 infants 1:6; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	*
Washington	*	Yes	No	does not meet FIDCR
West Virginia	1:6; 2 under 2 yrs. old	No	No	does not meet FIDCR
Wisconsin	1:3 infants 1:4 all under 2½ yrs. old 1:5 3 under 2½ yrs. old	Yes	Yes	meets FIDCR
Wyoming	1:6; 3 under 2 yrs. old	Yes	Yes	*

1 information from Comparative Licensing Study, 1982
* not specified

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF STATE REGULATIONS

FOR INFANT AND TODDLER DAY CARE

Facility	Ratio		Group Size		Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care
	Infant	Toddler	Infant	Toddler	Director	Caregiver	
ay Care Centers							
# states meet FIDCR	3	4	3	11	24	8	21
# of states do not meet FIDCR	47	46	47	39	26	42	29

amily Day Care omes	Group Composition	Staff Training in Child Care		Program of Care
		Director	Caregiver	
# states meet FIDCR	11	6	5	10
# of states do not meet FIDCR	39	44	45	40

BEST COPY AVAILABLE